

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 ANTHONY VIGEANT,) CASE NO. CV 15-628-GW (PJW)
11)
12) Petitioner,) ORDER ACCEPTING FINAL REPORT AND
13) v.) ADOPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS,
14) AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF UNITED
15) STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE, AND
16) DENYING CERTIFICATE OF
17) APPEALABILITY
18)
19) Respondent.)
20)
21)
22)
23)
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)

16 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 636, the Court has reviewed the
17 Petition, the records on file, and the Final Report and Recommendation
18 of the United States Magistrate Judge. Further, the Court has engaged
19 in a *de novo* review of those portions of the Final Report to which
20 Petitioner has objected. The Court accepts the Final Report and
21 adopts the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the
22 Magistrate Judge.¹

23 Further, for the reasons stated in the Final Report and
24 Recommendation, the Court finds that Petitioner has not made a
25 substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right and,
26

27
28 ¹ The Court notes that there is a typo on page 21, line 18 of
the Final Report wherein the magistrate judge refers to "Hernandez"
instead of "Pettigrew." Other than that, the Court accepts the
Final Report and Recommendation as written.

1 therefore, a certificate of appealability is denied. See 28 U.S.C.
2 § 2253(c)(2); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b); *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S.
3 322, 336 (2003).

4
5 DATED: Jan. 16, 2019.

6
7
8 
9 GEORGE H. WU
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE